WILLIAM L. ANTHONY (State Bar No. 106908) ERIC L. WESENBERG (State Bar No. 139696) MARK R. WEINSTEIN (State Bar No. 193043) 2801 AUG 29 PH 3: 59 2 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP RICHALO W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. LISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 1000 Marsh Road 3 Menlo Park, CA 94025 (650) 614-7400 Telephone: 4 (650) 614-7401 Facsimile: 5 JAMES E. GERINGER (admitted Pro Hac Vice) JOHN D. VANDENBERG (admitted Pro Hac Vice) 6 KLAROUIST SPARKMAN, LLP One World Trade Center, Suite 1600 7 121 S.W. Salmon Street Portland, OR 97204 8 (503) 226-7391 Telephone: (503) 228-9446 Facsimile: 9 Attorneys for Defendant 10 MICROSOFT CORPORATION 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 13 14 CASE NO: C 01-1640 SBA INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES 15 CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation, MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S 16 ANSWER TO THE SECOND Plaintiff, AMENDED COMPLAINT 17 ν. 18 MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation, 19 Defendant. 20 21 Defendant Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") answers the Second Amended 22 Complaint of InterTrust Technologies Corporation ("InterTrust") as follows: 23 Microsoft admits that the Second Amended Complaint purports to state a 1. 24 cause of action under the patent laws of the United States, 35 United States Code, §§ 271 and 25 281. Microsoft denies that it has infringed or now infringes the patents asserted against Microsoft 26 in the Second Amended Complaint. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations of 27 paragraph 1 of the Second Amended Complaint. 28

DOCSSV1:158435.1

ORRICK HERRINGTON

& SUTCLIFFE LLP

MICROSOFT'S CORPORATION'S ANSWER TO SECOND


AMENDED COMPLAINT, CASE NO. C 01-1640 SBA

- 2. Microsoft admits that the Second Amended Complaint purports to state a cause of action over which this Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 3. Microsoft admits, for purposes of this action only, that venue is proper in this judicial district. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 3 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Microsoft admits the allegations of paragraph4 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- Microsoft admits the allegations of paragraph 5 of the Second Amended
   Complaint.
- 6. Microsoft admits, for purposes of this action only, that it transacts business in this judicial district. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 6 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- Microsoft admits that on its face the title page of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,683 B1 ("the '683 Patent") states that it was issued February 6, 2001, is entitled "Trusted and secure techniques, systems and methods for item delivery and execution," and lists "InterTrust Technologies Corp." as the assignee. Microsoft admits that a copy of the '683 Patent was attached to the copy of the Second Amended Complaint delivered to counsel for Microsoft, but denies that such copy was full and complete insofar as it did not include any material purportedly incorporated by reference therein. Microsoft denies that the '683 Patent was duly and lawfully issued. Microsoft further denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 7 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 8. Microsoft admits that on its face the title page of U.S. Patent No. 6,253,193 B1 ("the '193 Patent") states that it was issued June 26, 2001, is entitled "Systems and methods for the secure transaction management and electronic rights protection," and lists "InterTrust Technologies Corporation" as the assignee. Microsoft admits that a copy of text associated with the '193 Patent was attached to the copy of the Second Amended Complaint delivered to counsel for Microsoft, but denies that such copy was full and complete as it did not include, among other DOCSSVI:158435.1

ORRICK
HERRINGTON
& SUTCLIFFE LLP
SHEED VALLY

things, any of the drawings or figures. Microsoft further denies such copy was full and complete insofar as it did not include any material purportedly incorporated by reference therein. Microsoft denies that the '193 Patent was duly and lawfully issued. Microsoft further denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 8 of the Second Amended Complaint.

- 9. Microsoft admits that on its face the title page of U.S. Patent No. 5,940,504 ("the '504 Patent") states that it was issued August 17, 1999 and is entitled "Licensing management system and method in which datagrams including an addressee of a licensee and indicative of use of a licensed product are sent from the licensee's site." Microsoft admits that a copy of the '504 Patent was attached to the copy of the Second Amended Complaint delivered to counsel for Microsoft. Microsoft denies that the '504 Patent was duly and lawfully issued. Microsoft further denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 9 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 10. Microsoft admits that on its face the title page of U.S. Patent No. 5,920,861 ("the '861 Patent") states that it was issued July 6, 1999, is entitled "Techniques for defining, using and manipulating rights management data structures," and lists "InterTrust Technologies Corp." as the assignee. Microsoft admits that a copy of the '861 Patent was attached to the copy of the Second Amended Complaint delivered to counsel for Microsoft, but denies that such copy was full and complete insofar as it did not include any material purportedly incorporated by reference therein. Microsoft denies that the '861 Patent was duly and lawfully issued. Microsoft further denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 10 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 11. Microsoft repeats and reasserts its responses to paragraphs 1-7 of the Second Amended Complaint, as if fully restated herein.
- 12. Microsoft admits that the Second Amended Complaint purports to state a cause of action under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281. Microsoft denies that it has infringed or now infringes the patents asserted against Microsoft in the Second Amended Complaint. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 12 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 13. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 13 of the Second DOXSSVI:158435.1




ORRICK
HERRINGTON
& SUTCLIFFE LLP

27

DOCSSV1:158435.1

///

Second Amended Complaint, as if fully restated herein.



23

24

25

26



	26.	Microsoft admits that the Second Amended Complaint purports to state a
cause of actio	n under	35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281. Microsoft denies that it has infringed or now
infringes the p	oatents a	sserted against Microsoft in the Second Amended Complaint. Microsoft
denies any and	d all ren	naining allegations of paragraph 26 of the Second Amended Complaint.

- 27. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 27 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 28. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 28 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 29. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 29 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 30. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 31. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 31 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 32. Microsoft repeats and reasserts its responses to paragraphs 1-6 and 10 of the Second Amended Complaint, as if fully restated herein.
- 33. Microsoft admits that the Second Amended Complaint purports to state a cause of action under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281. Microsoft denies that it has infringed or now infringes the patents asserted against Microsoft in the Second Amended Complaint. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 33 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 34. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 34 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 35. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 35 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 36. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 36 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 37. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 37 of the Second Amended Complaint.

  DOCSSVI:158435.1



38. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 38 of the Second Amended Complaint.

### AFFIRMATIVE AND OTHER DEFENSES

Further answering the Second Amended Complaint, Microsoft asserts the following defenses. Microsoft reserves the right to amend its answer with additional defenses as further information is obtained.

## First Defense: Noninfringement of the Asserted Patents

- 1. Microsoft has not infringed, contributed to the infringement of, or induced the infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,683 B1 ("the '683 Patent"), U.S. Patent No. 6,253,193 B1 ("the '193 Patent"), U.S. Patent No. 5,940,504 ("the '504 Patent") or U.S. Patent No. 5,920,861 ("the '861 Patent"), and is not liable for infringement thereof.
- 2. Any and all Microsoft products or actions that are accused of infringement have substantial uses that do not infringe and therefore cannot induce or contribute to the infringement of the '683 Patent, the '193 Patent, the '504 Patent or the '861 Patent.

### Second Defense: Invalidity of the Asserted Patents

3. On information and belief, the '683 Patent, the '193 Patent, the '504 Patent and the '861 Patent are invalid for failing to comply with the provisions of the Patent Laws, Title 35 U.S.C., including without limitation one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112.


### Third Defense: Unavailability of Relief

4. On information and belief, Plaintiff has failed to plead and meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and is not entitled to any alleged damages prior to providing any actual notice to Microsoft of the '683 Patent, the '193 Patent, the '504 Patent or the '861 Patent.

### Fourth Defense: Unavailability of Relief

5. On information and belief, Plaintiff has failed to plead and meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 284 for enhanced damages and is not entitled to any damages prior to providing any actual notice to Microsoft of the '683 Patent, the '193 Patent, the '504 Patent, and/or the '861 Patent, and any alleged infringement thereof.

DOCSSVI:158435.1



6. On information and belief, Plaintiff has failed to plead and meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 287, and has otherwise failed to show that it is entitled to any damages.

# Sixth Defense: Prosecution History Estoppel

7. Plaintiff's alleged causes of action for patent infringement are barred under the doctrine of prosecution history estoppel, and Plaintiff is estopped from claiming that the '683 Patent, the '193 Patent, the '504 Patent, and/or the '861 Patent covers or includes any accused Microsoft product or method.

# Seventh Defense: Dedication to the Public

8. Plaintiff has dedicated to the public all methods, apparatus, and products disclosed in the '683 Patent, the '193 Patent, the '504 Patent, and/or the '861 Patent, but not literally claimed therein, and is estopped from claiming infringement by any such public domain methods, apparatus, and products.

# Eighth Defense: Use/Manufacture By/For United States Government

9. To the extent that any accused product has been used or manufactured by or for the United States, Plaintiff's claims and demands for relief are barred by 28 U.S.C. § 1498.

### Ninth Defense: License

10. To the extent that any of Plaintiff's allegations of infringement are premised on the alleged use, sale, or offer for sale of products that were manufactured by or for a licensee of InterTrust and/or provided by or to Microsoft to or by a licensee of InterTrust, such allegations are barred pursuant to license.

### Tenth Defense: Acquiescence

Plaintiff has acquiesced in at least those acts of Microsoft that are alleged to infringe the '861 Patent, the '683 Patent, and the '193 Patent.

### Eleventh Defense: Laches

Plaintiff's claims for relief are barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable doctrine of laches.

DOCSSVI:158435.1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26



WHEREFORE, Microsoft prays for the following relief:

- The Court enter judgment against InterTrust on, and dismiss with A. prejudice, any and all claims of the Second Amended Complaint;
  - The Court award to Microsoft its reasonable costs and attorneys' fees; and B.
  - The Court grant to Microsoft such other and further relief as may be C.

deemed just and appropriate.

DATED: August 29, 2001

ERIC L. WESENBERG

MARK R. WEINSTEIN ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP

1000 Marsh Road

Menlo Park, CA 94025 Telephone: 650-614-7400

STEVEN ALEXANDER KRISTIN L. CLEVELAND JAMES E. GERINGER JOHN D. VANDENBERG KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP One World Trade Center, Suite 1600 121 S.W. Salmon Street Portland, OR 97204 Telephone: (503) 226-7391

Attorneys for Defendant Microsoft Corporation

27

28

ORRICK

HERRINGTON

& SUTCLIFFE LLP

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

DOCSSV1:158435.1